

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected. Claims 3, 4, 6 and 7 are objected to.

Claims 3-6 are herein amended. No new matter has been presented. Claims 1 and 2 are herein canceled

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 are objected to because the Examiner asserts that in line 2 of claim 1, the phrase “by etching on a surface of a substrate of layered PN layers” should be replaced by “by etching of layered PN layers on a surface of a substrate”. Applicants cancel claim 1 and amend claim 3 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion.

The Examiner further asserts that on line 2 of claims 3 to 6, the word “a” should be inserted before “light-blocking”. Applicants amend claims 3 to 6 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion.

The Examiner asserts that in claim 4, “a pair” should be replaced by “another pair” on line 5, “a” should be inserted before “wraparound” on line 9, “the pair” should be replaced by “said another pair” on line 10, and “provided to each surface” should be replaced by “formed on said each surface” on line 11. Applicants amend claim 4 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion.

Application No. 10/594,442
Attorney Docket No. 063100

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Amendment filed June 11, 2010

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Shibata et al. (US 2002/0070383).

Applicant herein cancels claims 1 and 2, thus mooting this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata et al. (U.S. 2002/0070383) in view of Chosa et al. (U.S. 6,219,074).

The Examiner asserts that Shibata et al. differs from the claimed invention only by not showing a printer head characterized in comprising as a light source the light-emitting diode array according to claim 1 or 2.

Applicant herein amends claim 3 to render it in independent form, which the Examiner deemed to render it allowable. Claim 5 is amended to depend from either claim 3 or claim 4. Because claim 5 depends from claim 3 or claim 4, both of which are indicated as allowable, Applicant submits that claim 5 is similarly allowable.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

Application No. 10/594,442
Attorney Docket No. 063100

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Amendment filed June 11, 2010

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely, Applicant petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/Kenneth H. Salen/

Kenneth H. Salen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,077
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

KHS/nrp